



Asylum Ave., Hartford,
Conn., U.S.A. 18/1/12.

My dear Goldzyther,

First, most sincere and
heartily congratulations from
us both on your fortieth
anniversary. I was able at the
time to write only a very short
article but I sent it from my
heart. May your teaching and
writing years be very many
more to the advantage of us
all!
יבדכך יהיה וישמך נא!
יהיה פנו אליך ויחנך נא יהיה פנו
אליך וישם לך שלום:

And now for your review
of my books. It has given me
great pleasure and I have learned
many things from it. Of course
yours is the only one which has
given me anything to think
about. I knew, of course, that

quantity, but has nothing at all an internal quantity. We simply describe it. And I don't remember seeing it dealt with elsewhere. I am not speaking here of ahwal but of al-fuduli's own system. Finally, of Allah and al-hagg = Reality. I am afraid I am incriminated.

The passage in feridh (X, 10) which you cite Q'ash is said to be ITSH but does not that mean "faithfulness" "trustworthiness"? It does not seem like parallel in feeling with hagg in fundamental ideas. And al-hagg in the Q'ash always gives me the feeling of something more concrete than al-fuduli's.

But believe me that I am very grateful for your review. It has given me much pleasure and I have learned much from it.

Now is a little point that is puzzling me. Did palmistry (cheirumancy) ever exist among the Muslims? I am afraid nothing except that Boethius translated palmistry by اليد but I think

we should disagree on many points. Let me say a word on some where I think you have not quite put my point. On the logos-Qur'an question I think that the doctrine developed before there were either Hanbalites or Maturidites. It came, if I may guess, in the early, dark, period of the latter part of the first ~~century~~ century! Muslim century and the beginning of the second. It was fixed and crystallized when Ahmad b. Hanbal found it. Then, as the internal unity of Allah, I do not dispute that Muslim believe it, but I do not find the Mutakallims have proved it. For instance, in my Development ^(p. 325) al-fuduli speaks of "internal quantity" (kamus muttasil) and of "external quantity" (kamus munfasil) in the sense of Allah. Then, on p. 327, he disproves external

that is only because of the
البر in the classical al-ḥaqīq. There
should be points of contact with
an al-ḥaqīq but did the ashāb al-fir-
āsa ever look at the ḥaqīq in
the hand? Also would it be
possible to translate البر
in Fihrist, p. 312, l. 25, as
"hypnotizers"?

But enough!

Again our hearty congratulations
and good wishes to you both
for the New Year. خير وافر
خير وافر!

Faithfully Yours,
Duncan B. Wards
